

## Hungary and Hungarians in the Chronicle of Jan of Czarnkow

One of the more frequently researched themes in the narratives of medieval sources is the question of one's own vs. the other, the foreign. The problem of identity of medieval man is one of the most interesting subjects of research, especially among European historians who live and work in the world as it was shaped by the transformations of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, i.e. when the rise of modern national consciousness changed the reference framework for definitions of identity. Social transformations of the 19<sup>th</sup> century were based on the romantic understanding of the past, especially of the Middle Ages, which became an inspiration for those who tried to answer the question of who are the peoples living in western Europe.<sup>1</sup> A rapidly growing discipline of history at that time began examining the problem of the origins of European nations and concentrated its research on the times after 476 AD.<sup>2</sup>

Avoiding the traps of the too detailed and convoluted history of historiography and of ideological complications of the research on Europeans nations, the present paper aims at examining the theme of 'own and foreign', that is the simplest and yet fundamental point of departure in the process of defining one's identity.<sup>3</sup> Defining one's own condition against one's own opinion on the other, the foreign, is instinctive.<sup>4</sup> Marie Bláhová rightly states

<sup>1</sup> Sławomir Gawlas, 'Społeczny zasięg polskiej świadomości narodowej w późnym średniowieczu. Analiza mechanizmów zjawiska', *Przegląd Historyczny* 72 (1981), 637–660.

<sup>2</sup> On research on the Polish national consciousness in the Middle Ages see Sławomir Gawlas, 'Stan badań nad polską świadomością narodową w średniowieczu', in *Państwo naród stany w świadomości wieków średnich. Pamięci Bendykta Zientary 1928–1983*, eds. A. Gieysztor – S. Gawlas (Warszawa, 1990), 149–194; Sławomir Gawlas, 'Pytania o tożsamość średniowiecznych Polaków w świetle współczesnych dyskusji humanistyki', in *Symboliczne i realne podstawy tożsamości społecznej w średniowieczu*, eds. S. Gawlas – P. Żmudzki (Warszawa, 2017), 15–82.

<sup>3</sup> Henryk Samsonowicz, '„My Polacy”, czyli o początkach polskiej świadomości narodowej', in *Historia vero testis temporum*, eds. J. Smółucha et al. (Kraków, 2008), 617–627.

<sup>4</sup> Czech sources are better than Polish in this respect. See, e.g., Mariw Bláhová, 'Český národ ve staročeské kronice tak řečeného Dalimila', in *Historia vero testis temporum*, eds. J. Smółucha et al. (Kraków, 2008), 617–627.

that language became the fundamental factor of defining national identity on the peripheries of Latin Christendom, particularly in the eastern pockets, in Bohemia, Poland, also in Hungary.<sup>5</sup> In case of Hungary, language was a particularly strong factor because of the radical difference between the Hungarian and the Slavic linguistic codes. However, it must be stressed that the relation to Hungarians was one thing, while relation to the Hungarian Kingdom quite another. The latter gained in importance when the Árpádian dynasty died out and the throne in Buda went to the Angevins originating from France.

The Chronicle of Jan of Czakrnkow, the archdeakon of Gniezno, seems to be a valuable source to look for information on the relations between Poland and Hungary and Hungarians in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. The author concentrated on the description of the political events connected with the reign of Louis the Great in Poland.<sup>6</sup> The description is incrustated with remarks and comments relating to the king himself, to his mother, to the Kingdom of Hungary, and last, but not least, to the Hungarians themselves. Not that those comments are striking-

---

cha et al. (Kraków, 2008), 635–652. The work contains rich literature on the problems of medieval nationhood.

<sup>5</sup> Bláhová, 'Český národ', 639; see also, Aleksander Gieysztor, 'Konflikty narodowościowe na pograniczu niemiecko-słowiańskim w XIII-XIV wieku, i ich zasięg społeczny', *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 59 (1968), 197–212.

<sup>6</sup> Jan of Czakrnkow belonged to the elite and worked for the royal office from mid-sixties of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. Because of the scarcity of sources, his genealogy is not precisely known. Most probably he belonged to new gentry (szlachta), i.e., village heads and mayors who were promoted under the last Piast kings. His father was mayor of Czakrnkow. while Henryk and Szymon of Ruszkow from Silesia, who were scribes and notaries public in the royal office, were Jan's relatives. As a vice-chancellor, he belonged to the closest and most trusted associates of Casimir the Great. Later he was involved in a somewhat puzzling affair of stealing royal insignia from the king's grave. He was caught red-handed and banished by Queen Elizabeth, however, in the end he settled in Gniezno where he functioned quietly as the archdeacon of the cathedral chapter house. Towards the end of his life he was an intransigent detractor of the Angevins and their presence on the Polish throne, which of course is reflected in his Chronicle. Józef Sieradzki, 'Sprawa Janka z Czakrnkowa i jego utwór', *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 4 (1959), 33–43; Marek Derwich, 'Janko z Czakrnkowa a Kronika Wielkopolska', *Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis* 800, *Historia* 50, (Wrocław, 1980), 127–162; Jerzy Łojko, 'Przyczynki do życiorysu Janka z Czakrnkowa', *Roczniki Historyczne* 46 (1980), 133–140; Jan Pakulski, 'Kulisy sprawy Janka z Czakrnkowa', in *Genealogia. Rola związków rodzinnych i rodowych w życiu publicznym w Polsce średniowiecznej na tle porównawczym*, eds. A. Radzimiński – J. Wroniszewski (Toruń, 1996), 29–66; Krzysztof Ożóg, *Intelektualiści w służbie Królestwa Polskiego 1306–1382* (Kraków, 1995), 49–92; Andrzej Marzec, 'Szymon z Ruszkowa. Z badań nad personelem kancelarii królewskiej w czternastowiecznej Polsce', in *Ecclesie, regnum, fontes. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza*, eds. S. Gawlas et al. (Warszawa, 2014), 228–239; Dániel Bagi, 'Haraggal és elfoglultsággal? Czarnkowi János krónikája Nagy Lajos krakkói uralmáról', in *Arcana tabularii. Tanulmányok Solymosi László tiszteletére. II. kötet*, eds. A. Bárány et al. (Budapest – Debrecen, 2014), 655–669.

ly numerous. The author was not much interested in the southern neighbours of the Polish Kingdom, while the majority of the opinions concern Louis the Great and his mother Queen Elizabeth. It should be stressed that Jan did not consider either the king or his mother to be Hungarian in any way.

The Chronicler devotes the first longer comment to Louis the Great in the chapter in which he discusses the reasons why the Hungarian king became the successor of Casimir the Great.<sup>7</sup> Leaving aside the line of discussion of the intricacies and contexts of the Angevin succession to the Polish throne, it is important to notice that Jan stresses the link of Charles Robert, and therefore of his sons, with the original motherland, France. In his eyes, king Charles was “natione Gallicus et sapientissimus, Roperti regis Siciliae filiaster.”<sup>8</sup> Further on, Jan emphasizes the dynastic plans of Charles Robert pointing to his intentions to rule over three European kingdoms, Hungary, Poland and Sicily, in each of them seeing one of his sons on the throne.<sup>9</sup> Thus, it is clear that the archdeacon certainly did not take them for Hungarians: the identification of their dynastic attitudes and actions is very clear. If the Hungarian context of Luis is mentioned at all, it is unambiguously placed in the French context. Therefore, the indifference of Jan to matters Hungarian is not surprising. The kingdom of the Árpáds and Angevins and its interests do not stand in the centre of his attention. He definitely concentrates on the issues that are directly connected with the fate of the Polish Kingdom.

Such attitude influenced his description of the political events happening in Poland at that time. There is no room for the Hungarians, Hungarian officials or Hungarian influence on Polish politics at Louis's court, or that of his mother. Yet, it is obvious that both Louis and Elizabeth came with courtly retinues and noble followers who, to a great extent, must have been Hungarians. Very few of them appear on Jan's pages, and certainly not there where the problem is that of political decisions concerning Polish matters.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> The accession after Casimir's death has been widely researched. More recent publications: Jerzy Wyrozumski, 'Geneza sukcesji andegaweńskiej w Polsce', *Studia Historyczne* 25 (1982), 185–197; Stanisław Szczur, 'W sprawie sukcesji andegaweńskiej w Polsce', *Roczniki Historyczne* 75 (2009), 61–104; Andrzej Marzec, *Pod rządami nieobecnego monarchy. Królestwo Polskie 1370–1382* (Kraków, 2017), 40–51.

<sup>8</sup> *Ioannis de Czarnkow, Chronicon Polonorum*, in *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, 2, ed. Jan Szlachetowski, (Lwów, 1872), 637.

<sup>9</sup> “Habeat enim Karolus rex memoratus protunc tres filios, Ludovicum, Andream et Stephanum conceperatque in animo, quod Ludvicum in Polonia, Andream in Sicilia et Stephanum in Ungaria praeficeret in reges” – *Ioannis de Czarnkow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 637.

<sup>10</sup> Hungarians from the King's court were infrequently mentioned in Elizabeth's documents issued in the Kingdom of Poland – e.g. in October 1371, her marshal Mikosz, the treasurer

At the very beginning of his narrative the archdeacon mentions the prince Vladislaus of Opole, the Palatine of the Kingdom of Hungary, and the ban of Slavonia Peter Czudar who both came to Cracow in November 1370 as Louis's envoys. However, with regard to all the events preceding the coronation of the Angevin king, Jan is interested exclusively in the person of Vladislaus, Czudar is never mentioned again. The prince of Opole was obviously not seen as a Hungarian, but a prince of the Piast origin whose main mission in the eyes of the chronicler was mediation between the future monarch and the Polish political elites.<sup>11</sup> Neither does Jan mention Czudar who, like Vladislaus of Opole and Casimir of Slupsk, was among those who were rewarded richly by Louis on the occasion of the coronation. Probably the main reason was that Czudar's land of Bardiov, which he got from Louis on the occasion, was outside the borders of the Polish Kingdom.<sup>12</sup> All this does not mean that the chronicler consciously ignored the presence of the Hungarians in the retinues of Louis and Elizabeth.

There are, however, some instances in the chronicle where the presence of Hungarians and Hungarian matters are more prominent. The narrative concerning the return of Queen Elizabeth to Poland in 1376, the Lithuanian invasion, and the massacre of the Hungarians in Cracow<sup>13</sup> contains more informa-

---

Dimitr and a trusted knight Michal Pagan were mentioned by name. – *Kodeks Dyplomatyczny Małopolski*, vol. 3, ed. Franciszek Piekosiński (Kraków, 1887), no. 844.

- <sup>11</sup> Literature on Ladislaus of Opole is relatively rich. See for example: Antal Pór, 'Opuli László herceg, Magyarország nádorispánja', *Századok* 43 (1909), 537–554; Stanisław Sroka, 'Herzog Ladislaus von Opeln als ungarischer Palatin (1367–1372)', *Zeitschrift für Ost-mittleuropa-Forschung* 46 (1997), 224–234; Stanisław Sroka, *Książę Władysław Opolczyk na Węgrzech. Studium z dziejów stosunków polsko-węgierskich w XIV wieku* (Kraków 1996); Jerzy Sperka, *Władysław książę opolski, wieluński, kujawski, dobrzyński, pan Rusi, palatyn Węgier i namiestnik Polski (1326/30–8 or 18 May 1401)* (Kraków, 2016); Jerzy Sperka, 'Territorial Powers, System of Administration and the Inner Circle of Duke Władysław Opolczyk (+1401)', *Questiones Maedii Aevii Novae* 14 (2009), 361–388.
- <sup>12</sup> *Ioannis de Czarnkow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 645; for the Bardiov endowment for Czudar see extant document dated 25 November 1370 – *Sprawozdania z poszukiwań na Węgrzech dokonanych z ramienia Akademii Umiejętności*, eds. W. Baran et al. (Kraków, 1919), no. 29.
- <sup>13</sup> *Ioannis de Czarnkow, Chronicon Polonorum* 2, 674–677. Here the author of the chronicle endorsed the King's conduct, and certainly praised his common sense, which is quite exceptional. At the same time, he could not help making spiteful remarks concerning Queen Mother. Under the year 1376 he noted that Queen Elizabeth insisted on returning him to Cracow as viceroy although she had a very good endowment in Dalmatia. Apparently, the King was reluctant and the Queen abused him verbally. In return, the King, as a wise man who kept respect for the parent, decided to entrust the rule over Poland to her once again. – "Anno itaque eodem Elizabeth, mater domini Ludovici regis Ungariae, quae anno precedenti regnum Poloniae gubernandum filio suo regi Ungariae predicti dimiserat. (...) Regnum Poloniae a filio suo Ungariae rege ut sibi resignaret cum instantia petebat, reditus mitorum

tion pertinent to our theme. Describing the return of the Queen Mother after she had shortly administered Dalmatia, Jan writes that she set out to Cracow "cum magno comitatu Ungarorum".<sup>14</sup> It must have been her numerous courtiers and, undoubtedly, a group of Polish szlachta accompanying the Queen, all of them with a large number of servants.

It is, of course, obvious that the Queen, being of Polish extraction kept both Hungarian and Polish courtiers. No doubt, the Hungarian court was incomparably larger and more important than its Polish counterpart.<sup>15</sup> She inherited the Polish court from her late brother and must have decided about the most important positions anew.<sup>16</sup> Some of her officers are known by name, e.g., Jan and Spytek from Zarkzów who were the marshal of the Kingdom and the marshal of the court respectively. The other, as Jan himself admits, arrested him after the unfortunate affair of stealing the royal insignia from the grave of Casimir the Great.<sup>17</sup> The lists of witnesses in the documents contain also officers of the court of Casimir the Great. Dobiesław and Zawisza Kurozwęcki were the political core of the Queen's retinue and constituted the main support for the Angevins in Poland.<sup>18</sup> Still, it was the Hungarians who were the natural environment for the Queen during the years she spent far away from Poland since 1320.

A passage, which is exceptional for the whole chronicle because it throws some light on the Polish-Hungarian relations under Louis the Great, contains the description of the riots in December 1376, in Cracow. The considerable

---

milium, sibi in regno Dalmatiae per filium loco reditum regni Poloniae sibi assignatorum parvi pendens. Et quia dominus rex Ludovicus praefatus eiusdem voluntati subito acquiescere distulit, ipsa nimium provocata filio suo serenissimo quedam impetuosa opprobria dicere non expavit. Sicque rex prudentissimus, qui parentibus suis honorem, iuxta praeceptum divinum, affectuose impedere studebat, matri regnum Poloniae denuo commisit." One easily perceives the chronicler's deep maliciousness who, praising the king's discretion, stressed at the same time the quick temper and quarrelsome nature of the queen.

<sup>14</sup> Ioannis de Czarnkow, *Chronicon Polonorum*, 674.

<sup>15</sup> Jan Dąbrowski, *Elżbieta Łokietkówna 1305–1380* (Kraków, 1914, reprint Kraków, 2007), 25–47.

<sup>16</sup> For the growth of courtly structures see: Janusz Kurtyka, 'Problem identyczności urzędów ziemskich krakowskich i nadwornych w wiekach XIV–XVI', in *Urzędy dworu monarszego dawnej Rzeczypospolitej i państw ościennych*, eds. A. Gąsiorowski – R. Skowron (Kraków, 1996), 21–54; Andrzej Marzec, *Urzednicy malopolscy w otoczeniu Wladyslawa Lokietka i Kazimierza Wielkiego (1305–1370)* (Kraków, 2006), 188–200.

<sup>17</sup> Ioannis de Czarnkow, *Chronicon Polonorum*, 703.

<sup>18</sup> The shape of the political scene of the Polish monarchy of that time is discussed in, e.g.: Jan Dąbrowski, *Ostatnie lata Ludwika Wielkiego, 1370–1382* (Kraków, 1918, reprint Kraków, 2009); Janusz Kurtyka, *Tęczyńscy. Studium z dziejów polskiej elity możnowładczej w średniowieczu* (Kraków, 1997), 181–196; Robert Bubczyk, *Kariera rodziny Kurozwęckich w XIV wieku. Studium z dziejów powiązań polskiej elity politycznej z Andegawenami* (Warszawa, 2002); Marzec, *Pod rządami nieobecnego monarchy*, passim.

number of Hungarians following the Queen could not stay in the castle, so an inn was opened in the town for them. Jan, describing the events leading to the riot, writes about the Hungarians taking a cart of hay by force which was heading to the house of the Marshall of the Kingdom of Poland, Przedborz of Brzezie. The cart was then dragged to the Hungarian Inn.<sup>19</sup> The incident led to a quarrel and struggle between the servants of both sides. Certainly, a large number of Hungarians in Cracow must have been noticeable and their connection with the royal court must have made them self-confident if not cocksure. The confrontation with the Cracow rabble must have led to irritation and unrest. Definitely, this time the brawl got out of hand, showing the seriousness of the animosity between Poles and Hungarians. The contention about the cart of hay, which led to fighting, was to be settled by Jan Kmita of Wisnicz, the starosta (capitaneus) of Cracow. When he arrived, he was hit with an arrow and died on the spot. The chronicler honestly admits that no one knew who was responsible and whether the arrow was indeed deliberately sent towards Jan Kmita. As can be guessed, though, the violent death of the starosta became the reason for chasing the Hungarians.<sup>20</sup> The point of interest is, that in the following events not only the town rabble, but also the servants of the Polish nobles became intensively engaged in fighting the Hungarians. Although the Polish lords, e.g. marshal Przedbórz of Brzezie or Domarat of Pierzchno tried to save the abused and injured Hungarians, their servants were most actively engaged in attacking and killing them.<sup>21</sup> As the chronicler relates, Przedbórz had two young Hungarians hidden in his house, but when he left for the castle to tell the Queen of the riot, his servants robbed them of everything and

<sup>19</sup> "Ungarorum famuli currus foeni, qui nobili viro Przedborio de villa sua Brzeze od domum suam circa valvam Bochensem ducebatur, vi rapientes, ad sua hospitia trahebant." – *Ioannis de Czarnkow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 676.

<sup>20</sup> "[The Queen – A.M.] iussit nobilem virum dominum Kmitham, capitaneum castris et alios nobiles festine descendere, ut tumultum contentionis praefate sederant. Qui cum ad locum contentionis pervenissent, litigantes sedare praedictos volentes, quidam Ungarus, ut dicitur, quis tamen igitur ignoratur, sagittam emittens, utrum voluntarie vel non nescitur, dominum Jaschkonem Kmitham militem strenuum, capitaneum praedictum, ad collum ipsa sagitta sagitavit. Qui mox cadens de equo spiritum exhalavit." – *Ioannis de Czarnkow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 676. About Jan Kmita from Wisnicz, his family and career see Renata Trawka, *Kmitowie. Studium kariery politycznej i społecznej w późnośredniowiecznej Polsce*, (Kraków, 2005), 17–108.

<sup>21</sup> As Jan of Czarnkow states, Domarat from Pierzchno, of Grzymala arms, was rewarded by the Queen for saving the Hungarians. He became the starosta of Great Poland – *Ioannis de Czarnkow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 678; about the political turmoil connected with personal changes in starosta positions, and its interpretation see Marzec, *Pod rządami nieobecnego monarchy*, 137–148.



threw them out the window outside the town walls. The servants of the killed starosta Jan Kmita were definitely most aggressive, chasing without pity those Hungarians who tried to reach the royal castle. In Jan's dramatic narrative we read, for example, how the ladies of the court lowered ropes and ladders to help the runaways and save them from death. While the Queen ordered closing the gates to prevent the riot and massacre from getting into the castle. In one of the bloody episodes, a knight from the Queen's retinue, Michał Pogan (described by Jan as a Slav) was shamefully killed.<sup>22</sup>

Such a burst of violence could not be the result of a mere struggle for a cart of hay. Obviously the death of Jan Kmita was a serious spark which caused the explosion of a growing animosity. But there must have been other reasons for that high tension here. Jan of Czarnekow does not help us in identifying them, but we may look elsewhere for a possible explanation. The description of Louis's arrival at Cracow in 1370 reveals a distinct aloofness presented by the new monarch towards his new subjects, including the Polish political elites.<sup>23</sup> The king was not interested in building up a positive relation with his new kingdom. He put in charge of Cracow his mother who was the sister of the late Casimir the Great, and left Poland.<sup>24</sup> One of the consequences might have been the reflection of the attitude of common people towards Hungarians generally. The new monarch concentrated power in the hands of very few men, the starostas who were endowed with wide prerogatives, which may have been another reason for growing unrest, partly because of the officers' frauds, and partly from a general feeling of more or less defined feeling of injustice.<sup>25</sup> The chronicler does mention complaints about mistreatment

<sup>22</sup> *Ioannis de Czarnekow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 676–677.

<sup>23</sup> The events which took place in Cracow immediately after Louis's arrival and preceding his Coronation, the Coronation itself and the royal progress to Greater Poland have been the object of polemics in Polish historiography for more than 100 years: Stanisław Kętrzyński, 'Zapis Kazimierza Wielkiego dla Kazimierza Bogusławowica', *Przegląd historyczny* 14 (1912), 26–47, 164–194, 295–316; Dąbrowski, *Ostatnie lata*, 148–160; Jan Dąbrowski, 'Polityka Ade-gawieńska Kazimierza Wielkiego', *Kwartalnik historyczny* 36 (1922), 11–40; Oskar Halecki, 'O genezie i znaczeniu rządów andegawieńskich w Polsce', *Kwartalnik historyczny* 35 (1921), 31–68; Włodzimierz Dworzaczek, *Leliwici Tarnowscy. Z dziejów możnowładztwa małopolskiego wiek XIV–XVI* (Warszawa, 1971), 84–98; Tomasz Nowakowski, 'Polityka północna Polski w latach 1356–1364 na tle jej sytuacji wewnętrznej', *Akademia Techniczno-Rolnicza w Bydgoszczy. Zeszyty naukowe. Nauki społeczne* 72 (1980), 75–103; Andrzej Marzec, *Pod rządami nieobecnego monarchy*, 35–39.

<sup>24</sup> Dąbrowski, *Elżbieta Łokietkówna*, 92–154; Stanisław Sroka, *Elżbieta Łokietkówna* (Bydgoszcz, 1999).

<sup>25</sup> The starosta system in the 14th-century Poland is discussed in: Antoni Gąsiorowski, *Urząd-nicy zarządu lokalnego w późnośredniowiecznej Wielkopolsce* (Poznań 1970); Janusz Kurtyka, *Odrodzone Królestwo. Monarchia Władysława Łokietka i Kazimierza Wielkiego w świetle nowszych*

whenever applications against court injustice were put in the hands of the starosta. If a petitioner, having spent a lot of money, reached the king in Buda, he would send him back to Cracow to his mother, while she would send him back to Louis.<sup>26</sup> The result was that many cases stayed unresolved. Jan also writes about excessive and unreasonable fiscal policy of the starostas who wanted to secure the highest possible income for themselves and the royal treasury. The fiscal oppression of the starostas obviously found official justification in the Hungarian king's expectations concerning the taxes. Jan's testimony cannot be treated as absolutely trustworthy, there are, however, documents showing, e.g., a serious grudge of the Lublin burghers against their starosta which was arbitrated by Queen Elizabeth and the lords of Małopolska (Lesser Poland). Hence, we must not reject Jan's general reflection.<sup>27</sup>

Elsewhere in the Chronicle we can read that all who supported prince Vladislaus the White in his attempt to occupy the Kujawa region were oppressed by the starostas in the name of the king, either with imprisonment or high penalty payments.<sup>28</sup> Additionally, internal unrests, like the case of Vladislaus the White mentioned above, encouraged robberies and plundering for which the absent foreign monarch was blamed because he did nothing to eliminate criminals. As the chronicler puts it, the starostas neither tried nor

---

*badań* (Kraków, 2001), 122–147; Andrzej Marzec, 'Królewskie sądownictwo prawa polskiego za panowania Władysława Łokietka i Kazimierza Wielkiego', in *Právní kultura středověku*, eds. M. Nodl – P. Węcowski (Praha, 2016), 81–104. (Colloquia mediaevalia Pragensia 17).

<sup>26</sup> "Nemo etiam restitutionem haereditatum injuste ablatarum ab ipsa domina regina potuit habere. Nam ea, quae differre voluit, ad filium suum dominum Lodovicum regem remisit, et dominus rex viceversa ad matrem remittebat; sicque hominas talibus dilationibus attae-diati a monitionibus desistebant, sua negotia Dei ordinationi comittens." – *Ioannis de Czarnkow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 690.

<sup>27</sup> It is about a quarrel lasting a few years between the burghers of Lublin and and starosta of Lublin Piotr of Szczekociny. The burghers accused him of breaking city privileges, which brought financial losses to the city. The contention came to an end when Elizabeth appointed mediators from among the highest dignitaries of Little Poland, and the starosta was put under obligation to make up for the losses. – *Kodeks dyplomatyczny małopolski* 3, ed. Franciszek Piekosiński (Kraków, 1887), nr. 911; Bubczyk, *Kariera rodziny Kurozwęckich*, 134–135; Marzec, *Pod rządami nieobecnego monarchy*, 146.

<sup>28</sup> "Post cuius recessum [Władysław Biały – A.M.] multi nobiles et militares in Cuiavia, qui sibi adhaeserant capto ob hoc, et exactiones per capitaneos, diuturnae subiacent paupertati [sunt]." – *Ioannis de Czarnkow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 660–661: The colourful character of prince Władysław the White read: Józef Śliwiński, *Władysław Biały (1327/1333 – 20 Feb. 1388). Ostatni książę kujawski, największy podróżnik spośród Piastów* (Kraków, 2011); Stanisław Sroka, 'Władysław Biały w Pannonhalma', in Stanisław Sroka, *Z dziejów stosunków polsko-węgierskich w późnym średniowieczu* (Kraków, 1995), 127–137; Stanisław Sroka, 'Władysław Biały w Burgundii', *Studia Historyczne* 39 (1996), 151–158; Marzec, *Pod rządami nieobecnego monarchy*, 76–78, 83–96.



wanted to prevent robberies.<sup>29</sup> One more reason for the resentment against Hungarians was the King's reluctance in implementing the postulates of estate restitution, one of the most important conditions presented to the new king by his Polish subjects, mentioned by Jan in his chronicle<sup>30</sup>. Thus, the unresolved expectations and disappointments with the new monarch, as well as his mother who did nothing to meet the increasing problems, must have generated a growing resentment not only against the king, but also against his environment, and generally against the Hungarians. One may hypothesize that the petitioners who travelled to the king to Hungary might have met with arrogance and prejudice of Hungarian officials, which resulted in the construction of a negative stereotype of a Hungarian. Last but not least, one must not forget about the ambitions of the numerous courtiers. This was an important factor in Poland where the minority complex of the Polish members of the royal retinue was quite strong, particularly among the lesser courtiers who experienced directly the more privileged status of the Hungarians who came with Louis and Elizabeth. Add to that a common, and often significant, animosity of the commoners towards foreigners, to understand the background of the unfortunate events that took place in Cracow in 1376.

However, the description of the time of Louis's reign in Poland left to us by Jan of Czarnkow offers more than the riots in Cracow, which were undoubtedly the result of many and sundry reasons. We must think of the 12 years of his reign and the following two years of interregnum after his death treated in the Chronicle to find information which may lead to somewhat different conclusions. During that time the contacts between the knighthood elites of the two countries became intensified. Jan mentions numerous mis-

<sup>29</sup> "Huius autem regis tempore nulla stabilitas, nulla iustitia in regno Poloniae habebatur. Nam per capitaneos et burgravios ipsorum rapinae continue in bonis pauperum fiebant, et cum aliqui, bonis suis obligatis, versus Ungariam ivissent, regi quaerelas deponens, rex ipsos cum litteris suis, pro quibus magnas pecunias in cancellaria dare cogeantur, ad propria remittebat, sed ipsas capitanei minime advertentes, ipsos ut in antea maioribus gravaminibus affligebant; depraedationes quoque mercatorum in stratis opublicis et aliorum transeuntium et furta committebantur incessanter. Nec capitanei rapinas furta cohibebant, seu cohibere volebant, sed tantum propriis commodis inhyabant." – *Ioannis de Czarnkow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 721–722.

<sup>30</sup> *Ioannis de Czarnkow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 690, 697. Restitution of the estates confiscated by Casimir the Great was one of the main postulates which the Polish subjects put forward before Louis the Great: Karol Potkański, 'Sprawa restytucji, rok 1374 i 1381', in Karol Potkański, *Lehici, Polanie, Polska. Wybór pism* (Warszawa, 1965), 568–599; Karol Potkański, 'Jeszcze sprawa restytucji', and Karol Potkański, 'Sprawa restytucji, rok 1374 i 1381', in Karol Potkański, *Lehici, Polanie, Polska. Wybór pism* (Warszawa, 1965), 600–652; Dąbrowski, *Ostatnie lata*, 280–284.

sions of the Polish lords to the royal court of the Angevins, which was a major centre of power. Louis the Great was one of the most distinguished monarchs of his time in Europe, and so his court attracted those in search of career and wealth from all directions, Poland included. A good example are the church careers of the Silesian Piasts, not to mention Vladislaus of Opole who in return for his services to Louis became the palatine of the Kingdom of Hungary, and then became a powerful prince of Galicia.<sup>31</sup> The Chronicle is full of information about political contexts of the Polish visits to Buda, as e.g., in spring 1377 after appointments of the starostas in the Kingdom of Poland.<sup>32</sup> Another important event in the Polish-Hungarian relations was the second congress in Kosice in summer 1379 during which the lords of Wielkopolska (Greater Poland) were forced to accept Louis' decision of the succession of Maria Angevin to the Polish throne.<sup>33</sup> On another occasion, at the beginning of 1381 Louis nominated regents for Poland who were to represent the king after the death of Queen Elizabeth.<sup>34</sup> The interregnum which began after the king's death in September 1382 was a period particularly rich in mutual visits and

<sup>31</sup> Stanisław Sroka, 'Kariery kościelne Piastów śląskich na Węgrzech w pierwszej połowie XIV wieku', in Stanisław Sroka, *Z dziejów stosunków polsko-węgierskich w późnym średniowieczu* (Kraków, 1995), 49–102; Stanisław Sroka, *Polacy na Węgrzech za panowania Zygmunta Luksemburczyka* (Kraków, 2001).

<sup>32</sup> Jan of Czarnkow writes that after new starostas were nominated, at least one of them, Domarat of Pierzchno, went to Louis the Great, and on his return brought royal letters to the archbishop of Gniezno and other Polish bishops in which the King informed them about the plans concerning a military campaign against Lithuania – *Ioannis de Czarnkow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 678. The extant documents show that the group of Polish dignitaries who visited Hungary was quite numerous. Louis issued a document, which confirmed the transaction between prince Ladislaus of Opole and the bishop of Poznań Mikołaj of Kórnik. The document was issued in Vizsoly near Košice (Kassa) in April 1377. – *Kodeks dyplomatyczny katedry krakowskiej św. Wacława*, 2., ed. Franciszek Piekosiński (Kraków 1883), no. 299. The list of witnesses contains apart from Domarat the names of Sędziwój of Szubin, Dobiesław of Kurozwęki and Bodzęta of Kosowice.

<sup>33</sup> *Ioannis de Czarnkow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 711. The king demanded from the Polish political elite the acceptance of his daughter Maria as the heiress to the Polish crown. The dignitaries from Greater Poland together with the archbishop of Gniezno opposed the royal decision, while those from Cracow and Sandomierz had no objections. In the end the King ordered the town of Košice to close the gates and keep the Poles within, until they give in. Marzec, *Pod rządami nieobecnego monarchy*, 126–133.

<sup>34</sup> Dąbrowski, *Ostatnie lata*, 326–333; Marzec, *Pod rządami nieobecnego monarchy*, 159–174. During Lent in 1381, Louis called Bishop of Cracow Zawisza of Kurozwęki and some other dignitaries to Buda. The King appointed a board of curates who were to manage the Polish dominion of Louis. The members of the board were bishop Zawisza of Kurozwęki, the burgrave of Cracow Dobiesław of Kurozwęki, the starosta of Cracow Sędziwój of Szubin, the chancellor of Cracow Jan Radlica and the starosta of Greater Poland Domarat of Pierzchno. – *Ioannis de Czarnkow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 691.

contacts. Travelling to Buda was especially intensified after the Polish elites turned away from Sigismund of Luxemburg. In Jan's thorough description of the events at a time of political upheaval we may identify his attitude towards Hungary and Hungarians.

Thus, the Hungarians who took part in the negotiations with Polish lords concerning the accession are in his eyes merely the representatives of the Queen Widow, Elizabeth of Bosnia. There is no information about them as representatives of political elites, or of political views concerning the problems and conflicts about the Hungarian succession.<sup>35</sup> The only exception is his opinion is that the Hungarian starostas in Ruthenia, after the death of Luis the Great, shamefully and treacherously delivered some of the castles to the Lithuanian prince Lubart, for which one of them was imprisoned on orders of Elizabeth.<sup>36</sup> In Jan's narrative Hungary was represented by seen in Queen Elisabeth of Bosnia who tried to force her own point of view on the dynastic policy concerning the Polish throne. It is not difficult to see that for Jan the Hungarians seemed to have the advantage over the Polish lords in those accession negotiations. He disapproves of the submissiveness of the Polish lords and delegates who gave way to the Queen as soon as she promised generous presents and profits.<sup>37</sup> Obviously, the court in Buda still impressed the Polish lords strongly, while the Queen knew how to turn their animosities and ambitions to her own advantage. The break-through came only when Elizabeth

<sup>35</sup> The Chronicle informs us of large Hungarian delegations who came to the Kingdom of Poland. The first one came in December 1382 and confirmed retraction of the rights to the Polish crown of Sigismund Luxemburg. This delegation was led by two bishops, but Jan of Czarnekow does not quote their names. – *Ioannis de Czarnekow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 724. The other delegation arrived in spring 1383 headed by the bishop of Veszprém – *Ioannis de Czarnekow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 735.

<sup>36</sup> *Ioannis de Czarnekow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 722.

<sup>37</sup> This is noticeable in several points of the author's narrative. One is the effectively emphasized joy of the Polish szlachta on learning that Elizabeth herself took away the right of succession to the Polish crown from Sigismund Luxemburg. Earlier, Greater Poland and Kujavia refused obeisance to Sigismund, but only the Queen's action really put an end to their anxiety – *Ioannis de Czarnekow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 724. In May 1383, the leading Polish dignitaries met with the Queen in Košice and it was then that she managed to convince the Poles to her own conception of succession to both the Polish and Hungarian thrones. Jan writes spitefully: "Terrigenae autem donaria plurima ab ipsa regina se consequi existimantes, tractatibus prioribus, et quibusvis pactionibus penitus posttergatis, securitas transitu ac reditu accepto, venerunt in Coszcze, ubi donariis licet modicis, et promissorum magnitudine circumventi, nova pacta cum predicta domina regina inierant." See also: Kurtyka, *Tęczyńscy*, 199–200; Jarosław Nikodem, 'Elżbieta-Julianna-Jadwiga. Przyczynek do genezy związku polsko-litewskiego', in *Cognitioni gestorum. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza dedykowane prof. Jerzemu Strzelczykowi*, eds. D. A. Sikorski – A. M. Wyrwa (Poznań – Warszawa, 2006), 459–480; Marzec, *Pod rządami nieobecnego*, 224–227.

tried to gain their definite concessions to her demands by force. That was the moment when the Polish elites grew up to political independence.<sup>38</sup>

There is one more episode the description of which brings something more to that indistinct image of Hungary and Hungarians in Jan's Chronicle. Towards the end of his work, he writes about the events of 1383 when the Mazovian prince Siemowit IV tried to fight for the Polish crown. Jan mentions the arrival of the Hungarian army led by Sigismund of Luxemburg. The army was sent by Elizabeth of Bosnia to defeat the dangerous rival. Reflecting on the political and military aspects of the war, the chronicler adds a comment particularly hostile towards the Hungarians. Even though Jan takes looting and pillage during war as a matter of fact, describing many military conflicts in Poland, yet writing about the end of the military actions with the participation of Sigismund's troops, he characteristically observes:

"When the truce was called, the Hungarians, having lost very few while having done much wickedness in the Kingdom of Poland, chased with eternal curses and made rich by plentiful spoils, returned home unharmed to the great disgrace of the Poles. That wild tribe never hesitated to desecrate all churches to which they had access, not sparing either the sacrament of Lord's Body or the holy relics. Pox on all those who called that uncontrollable tribe to allegedly bring protection because the reason to call them was base envy rather than a will to help."<sup>39</sup> This is the unique spot in the whole Chronicle in which the author expressed such a radical and unambiguous opinion on the Hungarians.

The possible explanation is the fact that Jan of Czarnekow quite simply never met any Hungarians, or, if he came across them being employed at the court of Casimir the Great, he dealt exclusively with the elites. Therefore, he harboured no special feelings for them either way. In the description of the Cracow massacre of 1376 he evidently pities the Hungarians for the nightmare

<sup>38</sup> At the end of 1383, the starosta of Cracow, Sędziwój of Szubin with young knights and the burgrave of Sandomierz Jan of Tarnow set out to Zadar to bring the young princess Jadwiga to Cracow. The young knights were to be hostages to guarantee the safety of the princess and the accomplishment of the Polish commitment. Elizabeth arrested Sędziwój, and sent Jan back to Cracow to occupy the royal castle until the arrival of the Hungarian army. *Ioannis de Czarnekow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 750–751.

<sup>39</sup> "Quibus firmatis [treuga – A.M.] Ungari paucis ex se amissis, sed plurimis malis in regno Poloniae nephariae commisis, ad propria, retenta malediction aeterna, praedaeque nimia dati, cum confusione Polonorum gravi, incolumes redierunt. Nam saevissima gens omnes ecclesias ad quas pertingere poterat, violare non expavit, sacramenta dominici corporis et reliquias sanctorum minime deferendo. Atterrantur ergo confusionis scebie tempore aeterno, quorum studio haec gens indomita ad simulatae protectionis juvamina fuit evocate, quam plus dolo invidiae quam gratia subsidii constat fuisse eductam." – *Ioannis de Czarnekow, Chronicon Polonorum*, 743, 749.

they went through. However, the arrival of the Hungarian army hungry for spoils and a rich haul like any foreign army, must have agitated the arch-deacon of Gniezno. His objection to looting and robberies took the form of condemnation of the other, the foreign. He does denounce numerous excesses of the army of Vladislaus the White, of Bartosz of Odolanów, of the Mazovian prince or of the starostas of Wielkopolska. However, only the damages done by the "uncontrollable tribe" brought about the "great disgrace of the Poles." It seems that the striking foreignness of the people who did the damages was the critical factor of Jan's radical denouncement.

To conclude, we must admit that Jan's Chronicle is not a particularly rich source of information about the current image of Hungary and Hungarians in the eyes of a citizen of the Kingdom of Poland. The sparse remarks do not allow for wide speculation and interpretation. Yet, we may with some confidence say that the chronicler did not identify the Angevin dynasty with Hungary, and treated Hungarians as foreigners. He was able to identify Slavs who stayed in the service of the Hungarian monarchs or were simply their subjects as different from native Hungarians. Language was definitely a helpful tool. When describing the Cracow massacre and the Hungarian army of Sigismund of Luxemburg, he did not go for distinguishing Slavs from Hungarians. All this suggests that the opinion of Jan of Czarnkow about the southern neighbours was founded on random knowledge which, in turn, was coupled with excessive experience. Quite frankly, the Hungarian matter did not stand in the heart of his interest.